

Lake Michigan Coastal Program Advisory Board

Meeting 2

July 9, 2003

6:15 p.m.

Northwest Indiana Regional Planning Commission Office
6100 Southport Rd., Portage, IN

MINUTES

Mark Reshkin opened the meeting at 6:20 and welcomed all who attended. After the Pledge of Allegiance, Mike Molnar called the roll.

ROLL CALL

Board members: Henry Bliss (Porter Co. Citizen), Dorreen Carey (City of Gary), Edgar Corns (Agriculture), Dale Engquist (Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore), John Heidbreder (Historical Resources), Jack Hires (Lake Michigan Aquatic Resources), J. Allen Johnson (Lake County Citizen), Paul Labus (Local Land Trusts), Stephen Mosher (Port of Indiana), Dave Pilz (City of Valparaiso), Charlotte Read (Environment), Mark Reshkin (Universities), Ian Steele (Town of Michiana Shores), Tammy Steinhagen (LaPorte County Citizen), Don Wadleigh (USACOE), Jim Juricic (INDOT), Liz McCloskey (USFWS), Bill Moran (NRCS), Bill Satterlee (Porter County Commissioner--for John Evans)

Board members absent: Kevin Breitzke (NIRPC), Rudolph Clay (Lake County Commissioner), John Evans (Porter County Commissioner), William Hager (LaPorte County Commissioner), Tom Keilman (Industry and Business), Tim Morgan (Local Parks and Recreation), John Smolar (Lake Dependent Uses), Dionne Wesniewski (Tourism), Judy Beck (EPA), Adriane Blaesing (IDEM), Brian Miller (Sea Grant), Jan Miller (USACOE), Niles Parker (IDOC)

Other interested parties: Alex da Silva (IDEM), C.M. Bartholomey (Gary Post-Tribune), Reggie Korthals (NIRPC), Ed Spanopoulos (J.F. New), Larry Osterholz (DNR), Rob Simmons (IDEM), Tom Anderson (Save the Dunes Council), Keith Lake (Porter County Farm Bureau), Wendy Smith, Jennifer Gadzala (NIRPC), Stephen Davis (DNR), John Pavy (Lakeside Construction Co.), Gordon Tharp (Pines resident), Rita McCommache (Chesterton resident), Gene Matzat (Purdue Extension), Paulene Popaiad (Chesterton Tribune), Jeffery Gunning (Town of Ogden Dunes)

Lake Michigan Coastal Program/DNR Staff: Harry Nikides (Director of DNR Division of Soil Conservation), Mike Molnar (Lake Michigan Coastal Program Manager), Andi Pierce (LMCP Projects Coordinator), Jenny Kintzele (DNR Resource Specialist)

APPROVAL OF APRIL 30 MEETING MINUTES

Mark Reshkin called for comments on the April 30 meeting minutes. Henry Bliss asked whether any comments had been received. The following comments were discussed:

- Q. Should absent members be mentioned in the minutes?
- A. Yes, we talked about keeping track of absences at the last meeting, so they will be mentioned in the minutes and DNR staff will keep track of absences.
- Q. Can we list affiliations under 'other interested parties'?
- A. Only if they are provided. Mike Molnar pointed out the sign-in sheet and invited everyone to sign it.
- Q. The fourth paragraph on page two mentions that the "director will fill vacancies" on the CAB. To which director is this referring?
- A. John Goss, Director of the Department of Natural Resources

Mark Reshkin called for a motion to approve the minutes. J. Allen Johnson moved to approve the minutes and Jack Hires seconded. The motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS

Mark Reshkin mentioned that mission statement development would take place at a later meeting because the new business takes precedence. Charlotte Read asked about the procedure for alternates for board members. Mike Molnar explained that since John Goss appointed each member to the board, they have the vote. Voting members can send a proxy to gather information, but they cannot vote. Non-voting members can send proxies. If a voting member finds that he/she cannot attend the meetings, he/she must formally resign and the nomination process would be repeated to find a new member.

NEW BUSINESS

Mark Reshkin asked Harry Nikides to introduce the new Lake Michigan Coastal Program Manager, Mike Molnar. Harry then introduced Mike, and Mike said a few words about his experience and expectations for the program.

GRANT ISSUES (*Jenny Kintzele listed issues and guidance comments on a flip chart during this portion of the meeting – see attached document*)

Mark Reshkin introduced the meeting's principle activity, which was to select grant priorities for LMCP staff to use to prepare grant information for the upcoming grant cycle. Mark pointed out that the CAB's role is to help establish priorities, not to create a rank ordering. Mike Molnar then presented the staff's recommendations for discussion. (See Documents 3 and 4 in meeting packet.) Mike explained that we are 'working backwards' this grant cycle because the grant application for the 2003 grant money to be given out by DNR is already in at the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Normally, we'd establish the grant priorities and solicit bids before we submit the grant application to NOAA, but because of staff turnover and timing, this cycle is a bit different.

Mike then called for discussion of the Documents 3 and 4. Document 3 presents a more general approach to setting priorities, while Document 4 is more specific in that it arranges priorities by category; Coastal natural resources protection and restoration, coastal community enhancement and sustainability, and emerging issues. Mike pointed out that the priorities listed are not ranked in any way.

Mark Reshkin opened the floor for discussion.

Charlotte Read asked if the LMCP staff used these categories in selecting the grants we have already given. No. The grants that have been given out are Restoration Grants, which came about because NOAA gave Great Lakes Restoration Grants to Great Lake states in 2001. Indiana received a one-time allocation of \$1.75 million.

Mark Reshkin pointed out that there are several types of grants that come to mind from these priorities; i.e., research and inventory (understanding the resource), acquiring land, improving and restoring natural areas. Could these areas be used to focus the discussion? Bill Moran pointed out that there are lots of studies out there already and that this program should focus grant money on **on-the-ground projects**. Dave Pilz said that there is always a need for additional **studies and plans** as times and resources change, so a mix of projects is a must.

Mark Reshkin said that new stormwater requirements are going to introduce new technologies which will provide for a lot of partnership opportunities.

*Charlotte Read emphasized that **wetlands restoration** is an important priority area, especially isolated wetlands.*

*Doreen Carey liked Document 4, but said that it doesn't answer the question about planning vs. on-the-ground projects, which are integral to each other. It is also missing **stormwater/groundwater protection**. Mike Molnar pointed out that the MS4 issue brings up a good point with urban runoff, which might fall under category 2 or 3 on Document 4. One thing to consider would be pilot or demonstration projects.*

*Charlotte Read added that **open space** should be a priority.*

*Mark Reshkin noted that **sustainability of stormwater management plans** is something to consider. Things might get started but they might not persist without some planning. He also added that **shoreline access** should be a priority.*

*Dale Engquist said that **exotic species management** is an important priority that is missing from the list and should be added to category #1 on Document 4. Mike noted that aquatic nuisance species are being addressed by outside sources. (See Document #6)*

Mark Reshkin asked how this effort coordinates with other efforts (i.e. Il-IN Sea Grant). Mike answered that our goal is networking everything in the zone to reduce overlap and we are still working on ways to do that. Mark said that it might help for Mike Molnar to have some explanation of that interrelationship for the next meeting. That way the members might be able to help point out relationships when they see grant applications. Don Wadleigh suggested one way to help coordinate with other groups is to invite one or two agencies to each CAB meeting to talk about what they are doing.

Jack Hires asked how much money we will be giving away this grant cycle? Mark Reshkin answered around \$900,000. Mike Molnar explained that the DNR is making \$900,000 from the \$1.17 million NOAA grant available for local grants, which will include on-the-ground projects and planning projects.

*Doreen Carey suggested that **land acquisition** be added to Document 4 and that research not be a focus of this grant cycle. Charlotte Read and Edgar Corns agreed.*

*Paul Labus added that a **monitoring** component should be added to any eligible project.*

*Mark Reshkin said that he would like to see on-the-ground projects but also wants to see that we're doing it right, so **research** is an important component. The emphasis should remain on preservation.*

Charlotte Read asked how the LMCP could maximize opportunities and talent without duplicating efforts. Mike Molnar answered that there has been fear in the past that this program would force people to do something and he emphasized that it is a willing-participant program, not an enforcement program. J. Allen Johnson suggested that the LMCP staff figure out what funding is available to potential grantees outside this program as a way to avoid duplicating efforts. He also suggested that we make available a summary of activities that are already going on in the watershed to the potential grantees to help guide their efforts and avoid duplication. Liz McCloskey noted that EPA's Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) should be represented on the CAB, as they give out similar grants. Mike Molnar noted that Judy Beck of EPA is a non-voting member of the CAB. However, she has not been present at the first two meetings so far.

Henry Bliss asked whether LMCP staff intended to disseminate this list of priorities as a part of the RFP so applicants will understand how to apply or will it be used internally to narrow the list of applicants. Mike Molnar answered that it will be used both ways.

Stephen Mosher pointed out that because of the wide spectrum of viewpoints represented at the meeting, it might be helpful to look at what other states are doing on this issue. Mike Molnar agreed and said that Ohio also used a wide approach to listing priorities.

Jack Hires brought up the issue that the terms 'wetlands' and 'critical habitat' are hard to define so should be left off the list. Doreen Carey suggested that, since the CAB is deciding priorities for this year's grant cycle, we should keep in mind that they can be changed from year to year and not get too bogged down in defining specifics.

*Charlotte Read asked that **lakefill**, areas of Lake Michigan that have been filled with slag, be added to the list of priorities. She pointed out that as industries vacate these fills, they should go back to the public. She also added that projects on tributaries, such as adding meanders to ditches or **daylighting streams**, should be considered. Mike Molnar pointed out that any work that falls into the LMCP program area will be considered.*

Bill Moran suggested that a process has been identified:

- 1) on-the-ground projects*
- 2) monitoring or study component*
- 3) check for outside funding*

Mark Reshkin asked if there was agreement on those.

Paul Labus said that the CAB shouldn't emphasize outside funding issues because if we did, we'd have to exclude Category 1 on Document 4. Stephen Mosher suggested removing Category 1 from Document 4. Paul Labus disagreed, and Mike pointed out that we can't eliminate Category 1 because it's written into the program.

Tammy Stenhagen suggested that taking too narrow of a focus goes against the goals of the LMCP and that we should give out a general listing of priorities out to the community and see what comes back in.

Mark Reshkin summarized the discussion so far and said we have a good list of priorities to which we added a few things. Is that enough of a direction for staff to put together a grant application? He then asked for reactions.

Don Wadleigh noted that Category 2 in Document 4 appears to list priorities that apply to humans. He asked if there are things that have been left off the list (i.e. water supply). Mark Reshkin said that the LMCP shouldn't focus on water supply. J. Allen Johnson expressed the concern that the urban population might be excluded if LMCP resources were channeled to Category 2 rather than Category 1. Mike Molnar said that funds will be equitably distributed among all three categories. There will be no focus on a specific area. Bill Moran suggested that the LMCP use population affected as a criteria for deciding on grant applications. (i.e. urban vs. rural)

Mark Reshkin noted that beach access should be added to Category 2.

Doreen Carey asked about the priority called "urban park projects—not recreation". Mike Molnar clarified by noting that by recreation we mean soccer fields, playgrounds, etc. Projects such as trails, land acquisition and education are all fundable.

Mark Reshkin asked if the CAB was at a point where it could make recommendations.

Bill Mosher asked for more information about how funds will be distributed by the three areas. Mike Molnar said that the LMCP ensures a fair distribution across project types.

Henry Bliss suggested that the DNR staff update the list of priorities based on this list the CAB created and redistribute the list by e-mail.

There was discussion about the timing of the RFP. Mike Molnar referred to the time line provided in the meeting packet and noted that the RFP should be out by August 15. This board will not meet again before then. When the RFP is sent out, the list of priorities will be sent out as well to help guide applicants.

Doreen Carey moved that the CAB accept Document 4 with the additions from this discussion. Dale Engquist seconded the motion. Henry Bliss spoke against the motion and said that the priorities should be ranked. Doreen Carey amended the motion to accept the list as suggested and rank by e-mail. Mike pointed out that tabulating people's preferences will result in a de facto ranking. Henry Bliss said that the ranking didn't necessarily have to be used, but that it would reflect the feelings of the board. The amended motion passed.

GRANT CYCLE ISSUES

Mike Molnar referred to Document 2 in the meeting packet and pointed out that, since the LMCP is working backwards this grant cycle, it was decided that we'd take 2003 and 2004 project applications at the same time in order to catch up with the schedule. Currently, the program is working under the federal fiscal year (which starts October 1), but we will switch to the state fiscal year (which starts July 1) for 2004.

Don Wadleigh asked if the board would see all of the grant applications. Mike Molnar said that the LMCP staff would prepare project summaries for the board members instead of complete grant applications, which can be very lengthy.

NEXT MEETING

It was decided that meetings would be held quarterly on the 3rd Wednesday of the month. The next meeting is set for October 15, 2003 at Red Mill State Park in LaPorte County.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Save the Dunes Conservation Fund will offer an all-day workshop on September 19, 2003, entitled "Finding the Right Balance." Call 219-879-3564 for more information.

Lake Michigan Coast Week will be held during the week of September 14-20, 2003. The LMCP will sponsor a distance learning event on September 16 at 10:30 a.m. Aquatic Research Interactive will conduct a live dive in Lake Michigan which will be broadcast to several school classrooms and other sites around the state. Other activities will be posted to the LMCP website.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Andi Pierce, with assistance from Jenny Kintzele